#### UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

# BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCE

Ex parte JAMES R. DORAN, PAUL WILLIAM EVERETT, GORDAN G. GREENLEE and ASHRAF N. IBRAHIM

Application 10/037,175

MAILED

JAN **0/5** 2007

PAT. & T.M. OFFICE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES\_\_\_\_

#### ORDER RETURNING UNDOCKETED APPEAL TO EXAMINER

This application was electronically received at the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences (BPAI) on November 7, 2006. A review of the application has revealed that the application is not ready for docketing as an appeal. Accordingly, the application is herewith being returned to the examiner. The matters requiring attention prior to docketing are identified below.

An Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) was filed November 9, 2001. It is not clear from the record whether the examiner considered the IDS or whether the examiner notified appellants of why their submission did not meet the criteria set forth in 37 CFR §§ 1.97 and 1.98.

A review of the file indicates that on May 15, 2006, appellants filed an Appeal Brief under the rules set forth in 37 CFR § 41.37(c). However, the Appeal Brief filed on May 15, 2006, does not fully comply with the new rules under 37 CFR § 41.37(c).

### 37 CFR § 41.37(c) states in part:

- (c)(1) The brief shall contain the following items under appropriate headings and in the order indicated in paragraphs (c)(1)(I) through (c)(1)(x) of this section, except that a brief filed by an appellant who is not represented by a registered practitioner need only substantially comply with paragraphs (c)(1)(I) through (c)(1)(iv) and (c)(1)(vii) through (c)(1)(x) of this section:
  - (ix) *Evidence appendix*. An appendix containing copies of any evidence submitted pursuant to §§ 1.130, 1.131, 1.132 of this title or of any other evidence entered by the examiner and relied upon by appellant in the appeal, along with a statement setting forth where in the record that evidence was entered in the record by the examiner. Reference to unentered evidence is not permitted in the brief. See § 41.33 for treatment of evidence submitted after appeal. This appendix may also include copies of the evidence relied upon by the examiner as to grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal.

(x) **Related proceedings appendix**. An appendix containing copies of decisions rendered by a court or the Board in any proceeding identified pursuant to paragraph (c)(1)(ii) of this section.

An in-depth review of the Appeal Brief indicates that the following sections are missing from the Appeal Brief filed May 15, 2006:

- 1) "Evidence Appendix," as set forth in 37 CFR § 41.37(c)(1)(ix).
- 2) "Related Proceedings Appendix," as set forth in 37 CFR § 41.37(c)(1)(x).

It is required that a supplemental Appeal Brief be submitted that is in compliance with 37 CFR § 41.37(c). For more information on the Board's new rules, please see the web page entitled "More Information on the Rules of Practice Before the BPAI," Final Rule at:

http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/dcom/bpai/fr2004/moreinfo.html.

In addition, the Examiner's Answer mailed June 5, 2006, does not fully comply with the requirements of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedures (MPEP) § 1207.02. Specifically, the Examiner's Answer does not include:

"Claims Appendix" - A statement of whether the copy of the appealed claims contained in the appendix to the brief is correct and, if not, a correct

## Application 10/037,175

• •

copy of any incorrect claim.

Proper correction of the Examiner's Answer is required.

Accordingly, it is ORDERED that the application is returned to the examiner:

- 1) to consider the Information Disclosure Statement filed November 9, 2001;
- 2) to provide appropriate written notification by the examiner to appellants of such consideration; and
- 3) to hold the Appeal Brief filed on May 15, 2006, defective;
- 4) to notify appellants to file a supplemental Appeal Brief in compliance with 37 CFR § 41.37;
- 5) to vacate the Examiner's Answer mailed June 5, 2006, and submit a revised Examiner's Answer in accordance with the MPEP; and

## Application 10/037,175

. . .

6) for such further action as may be appropriate.

BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

O. P. Edgele for Dak Ham DALE M. SHAW

Deputy Chief Appeals Administrator (571)272-9797

## DMS/pgc

cc: John R. Pivnichny, Ph.D.
IBM Corporation, N50/040-4
1701 North Street
Endicott, NY 13760